

REMARKS

Claims 18-20, 22-37, 39, and 41-45 are currently pending in this application. Claims 18, 27, 32, and 41 have been amended to clarify certain features of these claims to expedite prosecution of this application, and without prejudice to pursuing these claims in unamended or other forms in a continuation or other application. Moreover, claim 42 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error, and not for any reason related to patentability. No claims have been added or canceled in this response.

In the Office Action mailed April 28, 2008, pending claims 18-20, 22-37, 39, and 41-45 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

- (A) Claims 41 and 42 were objected to because of minor informalities;
- (B) Claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 41, 42, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,202,008 to Beckett et al. ("Beckett '008"), U.S. Patent No. 6,691,310 to Hirasawa et al. ("Hirasawa"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,504,990 to Abecassis ("Abecassis");
- (C) Claims 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Beckett '008 including U.S. Patent No. 5,794,164 to Beckett et al. ("Beckett '164"), which is incorporated by reference in Beckett '008;
- (D) Claims 27, 29, 30, 32, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckett '008;
- (E) Claims 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Beckett '008 and U.S. Patent No. 6,601,056 to Kagle et al. ("Kagle");

(F) Claims 24, 25, 31, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Beckert '008 and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638 to Jones et al. ("Jones"); and

(G) Claims 29, 34, 37, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Beckert '008 and Kagle.

The undersigned attorney and his colleague, Aaron Poledna, wish to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on August 12, 2008, to discuss the present Office Action, the applied references, and the pending claims. The applicants request that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to correct such deficiencies.

The following remarks summarize and expand upon the results of the August 12th telephone conference, and they also reflect the agreements reached between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner during the telephone conference. For example, the following remarks reflect the Examiner's acknowledgement that the combination of Beckert '008, Hirasawa, and Abecassis cannot support a Section 103 rejection of amended claim 18.

A. Response to the Objection to claims 41 and 42

Claims 41 and 42 were objected to because of minor informalities. More specifically, claim 41 recites "the optical medial device," which has been amended as "the optical media device," in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. In addition, at line 4, claim 42 recites "the digital video and audio decompressing card," which has been amended as "the digital video and audio decompressing card," in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, the objections to claims 41 and 42 should be withdrawn.

B. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 41, 42, 44, and 45 (Beckert '008, Hirasawa, and Abecassis)

Claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 41, 42, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Beckert '008, Hirasawa, and Abecassis. As stated above, the Examiner acknowledged during the August 12th telephone conference that the combination of Beckert '008, Hirasawa, and Abecassis cannot support a Section 103 rejection of independent claim 18. Accordingly, in light of this agreement, the Section 103 rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 22, and 23 depend from base claim 18. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 19, 22, and 23 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to base claim 18, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

Independent claim 41, as amended, includes several features generally similar to those of claim 18 (e.g., a decompressing card that is configured to transmit processed audio and/or video data from a memory card via a data bus through an output port on an optical drive to an audio and/or video output device). Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claim 41 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 18, and for the additional features of this independent claim.

Claims 42, 44, and 45 depend from base claim 41. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 42, 44, and 45 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to base claim 41, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

C. Response to the Section 102 Rejection of Claims 28 and 33 (Beckert '008 and Beckert '164)

Claims 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Beckert '008 including Beckert '164, which is incorporated by reference in Beckert '008. Claim 28 depends from base claim 27, and claim 33 depends from base claim 32. Base claims 27 and 32, as amended, include several features generally similar to those of

claim 18 (e.g., a decompressing card that is configured to transmit processed audio and/or video data from a memory card via a data bus through an output port on an optical drive to an audio and/or video output device). Therefore, claims 27 and 32 are allowable over Beckett '008 and Beckett '164 for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 18, and for the additional features of these independent claims. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 28 and 33 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective base claims, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

D. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 27, 29, 30, 32, and 35 (Beckett '008)

Claims 27, 29, 30, 32, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckett '008. As stated above, independent claims 27 and 32 include several features generally similar to those of claim 18. Accordingly, Beckett '008 cannot support a Section 103 rejection of independent claims 27 and 32 for at least the reason that Beckett '008 cannot support a Section 103 rejection of claim 18, and for the additional features of these independent claims. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claims 27 and 32 should be withdrawn.

Claims 29 and 30 depend from base claim 27, and claim 35 depends from base claim 32. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 27, 29, 30, 32, and 35 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective base claims, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

E. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 20 and 26 (Beckett '008 and Kagle)

Claims 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Beckett '008 and Kagle. Claims 20 and 26 depend from base claim 18. The Office Action relies on Kagle for disclosing decompressing processes of MPEG layer 2 and/or layer 3, and for identifying the file format of the audio and/or video data stored on the memory card. (Office Action, pgs. 12 and 13.) Even assuming for the sake of argument

that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Kagle fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Beckett '008 to support a Section 103 rejection of base claim 18. For example, Kagle fails to disclose or suggest a decompressing card that is configured to transmit processed audio and/or video data from a memory card via a data bus through an output port on an optical drive to an audio and/or video output device. Accordingly, claims 20 and 26 are allowable over the combination of Beckett '008 and Kagle for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claim 18, and the additional features of corresponding dependent claims 20 and 26. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 20 and 26 should be withdrawn.

F. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 24, 25, 31, and 36 (Beckett '008 and Jones)

Claims 24, 25, 31, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Beckett '008 and Jones. Claims 24 and 25 depend from base claim 18, claim 31 depends from base claim 27, and claim 36 depends from base claim 32. As noted above, allowable base claims 27 and 32 include several features generally similar to those of base claim 18. The Office Action relies on Jones for disclosing the use of an adapter to accommodate second cards of various form factors. (Office Action, page 14.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Jones fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Beckett '008 to support a Section 103 rejection of base claims 18, 27, and 32. For example, Jones fails to disclose or suggest a decompressing card that is configured to transmit processed audio and/or video data from a memory card via a data bus through an output port on an optical drive to an audio and/or video output device. Accordingly, claims 24, 25, 31, and 36 are allowable over the combination of Beckett '008 and Jones for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claims 18, 27, and 32, and the additional features of corresponding dependent claims 24, 25, 31, and 36. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 24, 25, 31, and 36 should be withdrawn.

G. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 29, 34, 37, and 43
(Beckert '008 and Kagle)

Claims 29, 34, 37, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Beckert '008 and Kagle. Claim 29 depends from base claim 27, claims 34 and 37 depend from base claim 32, and claim 43 depends from base claim 41. As stated above, Kagle fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Beckert '008 to properly support a Section 103 rejection. Accordingly, claims 29, 34, 37, and 43 are allowable over the combination of Beckert '008 and Kagle for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or disclose the features of base claims 27, 32, and 41, and the additional features of corresponding dependent claims 29, 34, 37, and 43. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claims 29, 34, 37, and 43 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Cameron Pilling at (206) 359-6123.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Cameron B. Pilling
Registration No. 62,085

Date: August 27, 2008

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000